

**DRAWINGS OBJECTION**

According to the Office Action, “the drawings are objected to because replacement sheet Fig. 14 is a duplication of FIG. 15.” In compliance with the Office Action, FIG. 14 is hereby canceled.

## REMARKS

1. Claims 1-6 have been rejected based on 35 USC 102 as anticipated Keeney et al. (US007027655B2). Claims 1-6 have been rewritten to more precisely point out the subject matter being claimed, and submitted to be patentable in their present form over the cited reference.
2. The Office Action in particular erroneously states: "... Keeney et al. (Keeney) discloses a method of interactive television...", whereas Keeney discloses "Digital image compression with spatially varying quality levels determined by identifying areas of interest".
3. Further, the Office Action erroneously states that the Keeney method comprises the step of: "... generating an interrogation signal (See Fig. 2, Q-Map 50) with said computing component...", whereas Keeney states: "A Q-Map 50 may be created based on the areas of interest identified during the identifying step. Q-Map 50 provides information to encoder 40 regarding which areas of image 10 have been identified as areas of interest 30." Clearly, Keeney does not mention any "interrogation signal" at all in his disclosure (description and drawings). The reason is simple: his method is not related to the interactive television, and interrogation signals are not needed in his method.
4. The currently amended Claim 1 (similarly to the previously presented Claim 1) particularly recites a step of: "- generating **interrogation signals** with said computing component, taking into account the eye resolution, communicated in the coding characteristics, said interrogation signals include a first category containing information on the boundaries of at least one sector of the video image and/or a second category containing information on the quality levels of at least one sector of the video image at least for one user and / or for one group of users; ..."
5. A claim is anticipated only if **each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.** *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Consequently, the above quotations prove that Keeney cannot anticipate Claims 1-6, since the cited reference does not describe (either expressly or inherently) the step of ‘generating **interrogation signals**’ included in the methods recited in Claims 1-6. Hence, Claims 1-6 set forth at least one **novel step** deployed for carrying out the claimed methods, which step is **absent** in the cited reference that renders Claims 1-6 **patentable under 35 USC 102**.

6. Claim 14 has been rejected based on 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Keeney et al. (US007027655B2) in view of Griepentrog (US005894327A). Claim 14 has been rewritten to more precisely point out the subject matter being claimed, and submitted to be patentable in its present form over the cited references as shown below.

7. In its present form, Claim 14 recites: “The method of claim 1, wherein said display component is represented by a conventional CRT including: a screen, a gun-cathode, an electronic beam deflector, a size screen dot unit for dynamic control of the dot on the screen; said method further comprises: - successive transferring video signals of said sectors with different quality levels to the gun-cathode; - synchronous transferring a first group of said **interrogation signals** for said sectors each, wherein said **interrogation signals** of the first group carry encoding information on the boundaries of said each sector, said transferring the **interrogation signals** of the first group is provided to said electronic beam deflector; and - synchronous transferring a second group of said **interrogation signals** for said sectors each, wherein said **interrogation signals** of the second group carry encoding information on the quality levels of said sectors, and said transferring the **interrogation signals** of the second group is provided to said size screen dot unit.”

8. It is now apparent that neither Keeney nor Griepentrog teach the steps of “synchronous transferring a first group of said **interrogation signals**...” and “synchronous transferring a second group of said **interrogation signals**...”. Since Keeney and Griepentrog neither imply, nor explicitly / inherently describe such steps in their disclosures, they **may neither motivate nor suggest** the desirability of such steps of Claims 1 and 14 of the instant application. Therefore, Claims 1 and 14 render the inventive methods **unobvious** to those skilled in the art.

9. As MPEP 2141 35 U.S.C. 103; the Graham Factual Inquiries [R-3] II. BASIC CONSIDERATIONS WHICH APPLY TO OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS states: "When applying 35 U.S.C. 103, the following tenets of patent law must be adhered to: (A) The claimed invention must be considered as a whole; (B) The references must be considered as a whole and **must suggest** the desirability and thus the obviousness of making the combination; (C) The references must be viewed without the benefit of impermissible hindsight vision afforded by the claimed invention; and (D) Reasonable expectation of success is the standard with which obviousness is determined. *Hodosh v. Block Drug Co., Inc.*, 786 F.2d 1136, 1143 n.5, 229 USPQ 182, 187 n.5 (Fed. Cir. 1986)." Also, "A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention." *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).

10. Thusly, according to the quotations above, Claims 1 and 14 are submitted to be **patentable under 35 USC 103** over the cited prior art references.

11. Claims 2-11, 14-19, and 21 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 1, submitted above to be patentable under 35 USC 102/103, and since they contain additional limitations and additional novel features, they are submitted to be **fortiori patentable** over the cited prior art references.

12. Applicants have made diligent efforts to amend the instant specification and claims, so that they define novel steps, also submitted to render the claimed methods unobvious. However, if the specification and claims are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request the constructive assistance of the Examiner. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of the amended claims of instant application are hereby respectfully requested.

Patent Agent # 56,997:  (Aleksandr Smushkovich)

ALEKSANDR SMUSHKOVICH  
U.S. Patent Practitioner  
Registered by U.S. PTO#56997